

Doherty Memorial High School Project

School Building Committee (SBC) Meeting Minutes

Feasibility Study

Preferred Schematic Report (PSR) Vote

Meeting Date and Time:

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 18, 2019

TIME 6:30PM – 8:00PM

Introductions

Mr. Adams (CoW) welcomed all attendees and thanked everyone for coming. He introduced the Steering Committee and noted that the School Building Committee would be voting tonight on the Preferred Solution as part of the Preferred Schematic Report (PSR) being submitted to the MSBA. He introduced Ms. Crockett (LPA) to start the presentation.

Project team members and School Building Committee representatives in attendance include:

School Building Committee:

See sign-in sheet with Vote

City of Worcester, Department of Public Works & Parks (DPW&P)

K. Russell Adams, Assistant Commissioner

City of Worcester, School Department (WPS)

Maureen Binienda, Superintendent of Schools

Jim Bedard, Director of Environmental Management and Capital Projects

Sally Maloney, Principal Doherty Memorial High School

Lamoureux Pagano Associates, Architect (LPA)

Katie Crockett, President, LPA

Robert Para, Jr, Project Architect

Rick Lamoureux

Christina Bazelmans

Christopher M. Lee

Tishman Construction Corp. of MA, Owner's Project Manager (TCCMA)

Eugene Caruso

- **PSR Presentation:** Ms. Crockett noted the project has been working on this process since May and appreciates all the interest and input received from various sources. She said that LPA has worked for decades on these types of projects and that the presentation tonight has been consolidated to highlight the preferred solution for the School Building Committee to vote on. She made a reference to a quote from Marion Wright Edelman regarding the importance of making the world a better place than when we found it, to paraphrase the quote. This concise presentation marks the beginning of the design process with an occupancy scheduled for 2024. The team reviewed five options voted for further study in the PDP phase which include Code Upgrade, Add/Reno, New Construction at Doherty site, Foley Stadium site and Chandler Magnet site plus added land. We also looked at issues concerning what impact will there be for students at the school during construction and impact on Athletics as a few examples. The enrollment for the new school is going to be 1,670 students and will include an Advanced Academy and four Chapter 74 programs. We anticipate a new 420,000 GSF school.
- We looked for a 26-acre flat site and was very difficult to identify in the City. Ms. Crockett noted that the Code upgrade would be very expensive, and not meet the educational program requirements. The Add/Reno uses the whole site and requires parking under the playing field. The three new construction options presented tonight show the most promise;

The existing Doherty site on Highland Street for the new school is recommended as the preferred site. The new school at this site would include academic wings and steps up into the site intended to leave all existing Park amenities intact. She also showed a slide comparing the height of the new building in relationship to Newton Hill. Ms. Crockett introduced Mr. Rob Para of LPA to discuss phasing.

- **Phasing:** Mr. Para stated the new construction on the existing Doherty site would be a three phased process with other multiple smaller phases while the students remain in session throughout construction. An early enabling phase would happen in the summer of 2021, including things like paving existing site to provide temporary parking for about 200 cars. Next would be a barrier/fencing to separate the school from the construction site and establish a ring road around the construction site for access. Mr. Para noted that at the new South high school, the new construction is happening 30ft away from the existing school. Next phase of work would be the construction of the new school, then demolition and parking with the fields being constructed in 2025.

- Mr. Para explained that the Foley Stadium site is 14 acres on a flat site that provides an existing sports complex for the City. The site was an old swamp and was filled in the 1920's. The site would require piles to support the new school and would allow only one practice field with synthetic turf. Putting the project on this site would mean losing the use of the stadium for approximately 38 teams and 1,000 students. Beaver Brook Park fields are very active and located in a flood plain. Due to the flood plain, this site is not recommended for a new stadium site.
- Mr. Para said the Chandler Magnet is a 22-acre site, the school was built in the 1950's and presently used as an elementary school for 500 students. The new school would be 3 stories at the front and stepping up to 4 stories in the back. Additional land from WSU and the abutting residents would be needed. Along with the Foley site, this site would provide the least impact to the existing Doherty students during construction. Mr. Para said that there was also no other facility in the city to relocate the entire elementary school population. He then turned the presentation back to Ms. Crockett to discuss the site ranking matrix.
- Ms. Crockett said a perfect score would be 185 and there are no sites that meet that score. The impact to the Foley Stadium and Chandler Magnet existing facilities put the Doherty site with the best score. Total project budget range for the new school is approximately \$300 million. Ms. Crockett said the ranked preferred solution is the Doherty site and has been recommended by the Steering Committee and is being presented to the School Building Committee this evening for their vote.
- Ms. Crockett mentioned that beyond these three sites, we looked at other value-added options for providing fields that would be funded from different sources and schedules not related to the MSBA process for the new project. She asked Mr. Para to discuss these various options.
- Mr. Para noted that putting the new school at the Doherty site would result in loss of parking and fields during construction. He identified the existing Duffy Park that is near to the Doherty site for upgrade with a synthetic turf playing field that could be completed before construction starts for the new school, by the City. Approximate budget is estimated between \$4-5M.
- The Foley site was considered to possibly convert a few small parcels into parking and a play court which would provide better access to the site at a \$1.5M budget. Additionally, upgrade to the fields with new under drains could also be done. Approximate budget is estimated between \$5-7M.

- Fields at Beaver Brook Park was suggested to add a flat field and under drains. Approximate budget is estimated at \$575,000.
- Ms. Crockett explained that the costs for these options are not included in the MSBA scope and the high cost for a stadium replacement for Foley is a driving concern. She then asked for questions from the School Building Committee.

School Building Committee - Comments/Question (C/Q) & Response (R)

- 1) C/Q – The Mayor started by noting that the City is committed to funding the Duffy Park and Foley fields upgrade options.
- 2) C/Q – Councilor Bergman was noted that Mr. Shea (Athletic Director) was present and asked him to speak about the Foley Stadium and how it complicates the school program?
R) Mr. Shea said he was not opposed to the Foley site but was concerned where the teams and students could play if this site was selected. He said he was not aware of any plans to build a new stadium and that Foley is heavily used in the Fall and Spring by all schools. He mentioned that Colleges could not provide ideal times for student in the City and would take a back seat in practice and game slots. He noted that grass turf is severely damaged by football games.
- 3) C/Q – Is there consideration now for St. Peters site based on the recent news article.
R) Mr. Adams said he also read the article and it could take months for a decision from St. Peters and would jeopardize the schedule as part of the MSBA process for this project.
- 4) C/Q – Could there be bonding included for the field upgrades as part of the MSBA funding by the City?
R) Mr. Zidells noted the bonding authority for the Doherty project would be specifically for the new school and not the added fields. He stated that concurrent loan orders would be prepared once funds are identified for the new fields and could be brought before the City Council sometime in January.

Public Comments/Question (C/Q) & Response (R)

- 1) C/Q – What is the impact on traffic?
R – All site options have separate bus and parent drop off areas. The pedestrian traffic is also included in the PSR and will be further studied in the Schematic Design. It was noted that approximately 50% of the Doherty students walk to school.
- 2) C/Q - Chandler field upgrade was mentioned before?
R) – Mr. Adams confirmed that we had mentioned those fields in previous presentations but are no longer being considered in this project.
- 3) C/Q – A Chandler Student made a plea to keep her school at Chandler Magnet.

School Building Committee Roll Call Vote

Mr. Adams conducted a roll call vote of the School Building Committee members to submit the Preferred Schematic Report (PSR) to the MSBA on December 30, 2019. A roll call vote was made for each School Building Committee member and are documented on the attached SBC sign in sheet.

The results of the vote were Twenty (20) votes in favor, One (1) no vote against, One (1) abstention and One (1) absent.

End of meeting.

These summary comments reflect Tishman Construction Corporation of MA's interpretation of the discussions that took place. Any discrepancies or omissions should be brought to the author's attention immediately. This summary shall be included as part of the Project record.

Prepared By: Eugene Caruso, Owner's Project Manager, TCCMA

Date: December 18, 2019